THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 404. (Vol. IX.—21.) CHICAGO, MAY 23, 1895. { One Dollar per Year, / Single Copies, 5 Cents.

THE REACTION AGAINST THE PROPHETS.

BY PROF. C. H. CORNILL.

It was Hosea who first perceived that the traditional system of worship which in his eyes was flagrant paganism, constituted the real cancer that was eating the life of Israel. Isaiah shared his view, and, being of a practical nature, acted upon it. The prophecy of Israel openly and hostilely attacks the religion of the people and endeavors to mould it according to the prophetic ideal. That was no easy task and had, in the nature of the case, to meet with a bitter and fanatical opposition. We men of modern days can scarcely appreciate what religion means to a primitive people, how it governs and enters into all their relations and becomes the pulse and motive power of their whole life. On the other hand, the power of custom in religion cannot be too highly rated. Tradition is considered sacred because it is tradition. The heart clings to it. The solemn moments of life are inseparably bound up with it, and every alteration of it appears as blasphemy, as an insult to God.

And now let us consider the feelings of the people of Judah towards the reforms proposed and inaugurated by Isaiah. The ancient and honored relics, which could be traced back to the Patriarchs and to Moses, before which David had knelt, which from time immemorial had been to every Israelite the most sacred and beloved objects on earth, should now of a sudden, to quote Isaiah, be considered as filth to be cast to moles and bats, because a few fanatics in Jerusalem did not find them to their taste! Now indeed, if the new God whom the prophets preached (for thus he must have appeared to the people) had only been more powerful than the older, whom their fathers had worshipped, if things had only gone on better—well and good. But there was no trace of this.

So long as we were confined solely to the Old Testament for our knowledge of Jewish history, it was supposed naturally enough that with the futile attack on Jerusalem in the year 701 the Assyrian domination in Judah was broken for all time, and that Judah had again become free. But that is not the case. As a matter of fact the Assyrian power only attained to the zenith of its glory under the two successors of Sennacherib, Esarhaddon and Asurbanipal. It is true that Sennacherib did not again enter Palestine, as he had enough to do in the neighborhood of his own capital, and it may be that for a short time a certain respite was gained. But Israel remained as before an Assyrian province, and Judah as before the vassal of the Assyrian monarch, having yearly to send a tribute to Nineveh. In fact, the Assyrian rule became more and more oppressive. Esarhaddon had laid the keystone in the Assyrian domination of the world by his conquest of Egypt. Thrice in rapid succession had the Assyrian army forced its way to Thebes, and Assyrian viceroys governed Egypt as an Assyrian province. Asurbanipal had also fought in Egypt, in Arabia, and Syria, and we can easily understand that in all these attacks Judæa, the natural sallying-port from Asia into Africa, and the natural point of union between Syria and Egypt, was sucked into the raging whirlpool and suffered severely.

Such a state of affairs was not calculated to recommend the reform of the prophets. On the contrary, the religious sentiment of the people could not but see in it all a punishment inflicted by the national Deity for the neglect of his wonted service. The popular religion understood the great danger that threatened it. The prophecies had smitten it with a deadly stroke, but it was nevertheless not inclined to give up the struggle without a blow. It accepted the challenge and soon wrested a victory from the reformers.

It is true, so long as Hezekiah lived, submission was imperative. For the reform had become a law of the kingdom, enacted by him, and was in a certain measure his personal creation. He died in the year 686, leaving the kingdom to Manasseh, his son, a child twelve years old. How it came to pass, will forever remain an enigma, owing to the utter lack of records; but the fact remains certain that under Manasseh a terrible and bloody reaction set in against the prophets. This is the period of which Jeremiah says that the sacred sword devoured the prophets like a raging lion, when all Jerusalem was full of innocent blood from one end to the other. All that Hezekiah had destroyed was restored. No memories of the hated innovations were suffered to remain.

A further step was taken. Genuine paganism now made its entry into Judæa and Jerusalem. The overpowering strength of the Assyrians must have made a deep impression on their contemporaries. Were not the gods of Assyria more mighty than the gods of the nations subjugated by it? And so we find under Manasseh the Assyrio-Babylonian worship of the stars introduced into Judæa, and solemn festivals held in honor of it in the temple at Jerusalem. Even foreign habits and customs were adopted. The healthful simplicity of the fathers was discarded to exchange therefor the dangerous blessings of an overrefined and vitiated civilisation. This also had its effect on the worship of God. The ritual became more and more gaudy and elaborate. Incense, of which ancient Israel knew nothing, appears from this time as an essential constituent of the service, and even that most terrible of religious aberrations, the sacrificing of children, fully calculated to excite with gruesome and voluptuous titillation the unstrung nerves of an overwrought civilisation, became the fashion. King Manasseh himself made his firstborn son pass through the fire, and everywhere in Jerusalem did the altars of Moloch send up their smoke, whilst a bloody persecution was instituted against the prophets and all their party.

These events made on the minds of the devout men in Israel an indelible impression, and the prophecies of Isaiah as to the indestructibility of Zion and of the House of David, were forgotten in their terror. It became the settled conviction of the best spirits that God could never forgive all this, but that, owing to the sins of Manasseh, the destruction both of Judah and Jerusalem was inevitable.

It is a memorable fact that during this whole period, almost, prophecy remained dumb in Israel. We can only point to one brief fragment with anything like assurance, and that is now read as Chapter 6 and the beginning of Chapter 7 of the book of Micah. This fragment is one of the most beautiful that we possess, and still resounds, borne on Palestrina's magic notes, as an improperia, on every Good Friday in the Sistine Chapel at Rome. God pleads with Israel:

"O, my people, what have I done unto thee? And wherein have I wearied thee? Testify against me."

And as now the people bow themselves down before God in answer to His divine accusations, and are anxious to give up everything, even the first-born, for their transgressions, then speaks the prophet:

"He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

This fragment is important, as testifying how during this time of heavy affliction and persecution, piety deepened and became more spiritual; how it retired within itself and saw itself in an ever truer and clearer light, finally to come forth purified and strengthened.

Prophecy was again aroused from its slumbers by the trumpet tones of the world's history. In 650 the Assyrian empire was, if anything, greater and mightier than ever. But now destiny knocked at its gates. From the coasts of the Black Sea a storm broke forth over Asia, such as man had never before witnessed. Wild tribes of horsemen, after the manner of the later Huns and Mongolians, overran for more than twenty years all Asia on their fast horses, which seemed never to tire, spreading everywhere desolation and terror. Egypt had torn itself away from the rule of the Assyrians, and a new and terrible enemy in the Medes who were now consolidating their forces in the rear of Nineveh appeared. The Assyrian world-edifice cracked in all its joints, and grave revolutions were imminent. At once prophecy is at hand with the small but exceedingly valuable book of Zephaniah. The thunder of the last judgment rolls in Zephaniah's powerful words, whose dithyrambic lilt and wondrous music no translation can render. The *Dies iræ, dies illa*, which the Roman Church and the whole musical world now sings as a requiem, is taken word for word from Zephaniah.

"The great day of the Lord is near, it is near and hasteth greatly, even the voice of the day of the Lord; the mighty man shall cry there bitterly. That day is a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, a day of wasteness and desolation, a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness. A day of the trumpet and alarm against the fenced cities and against the high towers. And I will bring distress upon men, that they shall walk like blind men because they have sinned against the Lord; and their blood shall be poured out as dust, and their marrow as the dung. Neither their silver nor their gold shall be able to deliver them in the day of the Lord's wrath; but the whole land shall be devoured by the fire of his jealousy: for he shall make even a speedy riddance of all them that dwell in the land."

The cause of this terrible judgment is the sins of Manasseh, which Zephaniah describes with drastic vividness at the beginning of his book. Only the righteous and the meek of the earth shall escape, who will form at the end of time a people pleasing unto God.

In the time of Nahum events had progressed still further. His book has for its sole subject the impending destruction of Nineveh. It was probably written in the year 625, as the Medes under king Phraortes made their first attack on Nineveh, but did not accomplish their aim. The merited judgment shall now fall upon the Assyrian nation for all the oppressions and persecutions which it has brought upon the world,

and especially on the land and people of God. In a religious and prophetic sense the contents of the book are not important, but its æsthetic and poetical value is on that account the higher, the language full of power and strength, and possessing a pathos and fervor which only true passion can inspire. It is in a certain measure the cry of distress and revenge from all the nations oppressed and downtrodden by that detestable people, which is here re-echoed to us with irresistible power in the Book of Nahum.

The Book of Habakkuk also belongs to this series. The destruction of Nineveh is its subject. But in Habakkuk's Book the Chaldeans appear as the future instruments of the divine wrath. Habakkuk is a master of eloquence and imagery. His description of the Assyrian as the robber who opens his jaws like hell, and is as insatiable as death, who devoureth all people, and swalloweth down all nations, is among the most magnificent productions of Hebrew literature.

"He treateth men as the fishes of the sea, as creeping things that have no ruler over them. He fishes up all of them with the angle, he catches them in his net, and gathers them in his drag; therefore does he rejoice and is glad. Therefore he sacrifices unto his net, and burns incense unto his drag, because by them is his portion plenteous and his meat fat. Shall he then ever draw his sword, and not spare continually to slay the nations?"

In Habakkuk the ethical and religious element is duly treated. Pride causes the fall of the Assyrian, the *hybris* in the sense of Greek tragedy, for, as Habakkuk sharply and clearly defines it, he makes "his strength his God." Might for the Assyrian exceeds right. Because he has the might, he oppresses and enslaves nations which have done him no harm. The universal moral law demands his destruction.

* * *

But now we must retrace our steps for a time. As Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habakkuk form an intimately connected group, it appeared expedient to treat them together. But Jeremiah appeared before Nahum, and between Nahum and Habakkuk an event took place which ranks among the most important and momentous in the history of mankind.

THE BOW IN ART, METAPHOR, AND SONG.

BY GEORGE HENRY KNIGHT.

THAT potent factor in human evolution, the inventive faculty, appears to have been first exercised in the manufacture of weapons and, among weapons, the archer's bow occupied, deservedly, a very conspicuous place. The value set upon it by the ancients appears in their belief in its divine origin and in the reference to it in sacred and epic verse as a favorite weapon of their gods and heroes. That such estimation was not misplaced will be conceded when it is considered that by this, his earliest machine, the primordial hunter was enabled to take his first accurate and deliberate aim with slight muscular effort from a distant covert without betraying his presence to the weaker or engaging in close mortal combat with the more powerful creatures of the chase. In the missile's easy and certain penetration to a vital part, in the access afforded to such toothsome game as birds and fleet-footed ruminants, in the mastery given over all the hunter's predatory competitors (whether man or brute), and in the prolific field of invention thus opened[1], the archer's craft occupies a high rank among inventions that have inaugurated new eras in human progress.

The substantial identity of form, in all times and places,[2] and the improbability of a double origin of such an invention among savages, taken in connexion with its prevalence north and its comparative absence south of a definable boundary,[3] seem to indicate a single place of origin for the craft of archery. Innumerable collected specimens of indestructible flint arrowheads ranging from almost shapeless chips and flakes to blades having the mathematical perfection of a modern lancet, tell the story of their growth; but of the comparatively perishable bow, we are acquainted only with its last and perfected stage of development. A hint of its pedigree may, possibly, be found in some co-adaptation of the spear-casting thong (*amentum*) and some type of the spear-throwing staff, such as still seen among the Eskimos, the Paru Indians of the Amazon, the Pelew Islanders of the Pacific, the Uganda Negroes of Eastern Africa and certain Australian tribes. One eminent authority, however, suggests that:

"The spring-trap of the Malay Peninsula, described by Pierre Bourienne, is a contrivance that might readily (?) have suggested itself from the use of an elastic throwing-stick. When the spring is fastened down by a string or cord, it would soon (?) be perceived that, by attaching the end of the lance to the string, in-

[1] In the bow-rotated fire-drill may be detected the germ and prototype of modern machinery. The crafts of the bowyer and of the fire-maker led to the invention of firearms, thus: the gun-barrel had a twofold suggestion in the groove of the crossbow and the tube of the blow-gun; the stock, butt, sight, lock, and trigger, in like parts of the crossbow; the cock, pan, touch-hole and priming were adaptations of the prehistoric fire-striker, tinder and match. The crossbow was a portable catapult, itself a modification of the bow. Even the "spin" given to the bullet by a modern rifle is but an adaptation to firearms of the action produced by the spiral feathering of arrows of unknown antiquity. The divine arts of poetry and music even are largely indebted to the bowyer's craft, for it was to the accompaniments of the harp and the lyre that the bards of old recited their poems, and these instruments are clearly traceable to the bow.

[2] *Archery*, by C. L. Longman, p. 1.

[3] A "great circle" described on a map or globe about a center at or near the present city of London (see map in *Public Works of Great Britain*, by John Weale, 1840) defines very nearly the boundary of that half of the earth's surface to which the navigators of the sixteenth century, A. D., found a knowledge of the bow to be generally restricted.

stead of to the stick, it would be made to project the lance with great force and accuracy. The bow would thus be introduced."

The entire absence of the bow (and, so far as known, of the elsewhere so abundant arrowheads), from certain remote regions of the Southern Hemisphere, e. g. Australasia and the South American pampas may be due to one or more of several causes, such as the reluctance of barbarians to exchange old for new methods or that, long before the invention had penetrated to those parts, such fairly effective devices as the boomerang, the spear-caster and the weet-weet,[2] in the one case, and the blow-gun, the bolas, and the lariat, in the other case, had become too popular for displacement. Such competent judges, however, as Oskar Peschel[3] and N. Joly[4] have expressed a belief that, in such cases, archery should be regarded as a "lost art" whose disuse had probably arisen from lack of suitable prey; but, opposed to this view, we have the well-known obstinate adherence of savages to wonted usage even in the presence of better methods[5] and the seeming improbability that a hunting people, having once become familiarised with the use of the far-reaching, deadly arrow, would return to mere hurling devices in regions exceptionally rich in birds, a class of game which the arrow was singularly well fitted to reach. Former use, moreover, seems to be discredited by the lack, already adverted to, of spent arrow-heads.

But, beside its pre-eminence as an instrument of war and the chase and of primitive industrial art, the bow was a not unimportant factor in the birth and early development of the divine arts of music and song. In devices still used by certain primitive peoples,[6] in numerous antique pictured and sculptured records,[1] and even in specimens recovered from ancient tombs,[2] we have abundant evidence that, in some remote prehistoric past,

"When music, heavenly maid, was young,"

the archer's bow led to the harp and thus to stringed instruments of all kinds; to become, in turn, the recognised symbol of martial prowess and of sovereign power, conspicuously apparent in rock and mural inscriptions of India and of Egypt and other Levantine nations of antiquity. A triumphal pæan from the old Aryan conquerors of India contains the following invocation to the bow:

"May the bow bring us spoils and oxen.
May the bow be victorious in the heat of the fight.
The bow fills the world with fear.
May the bow give us victory over the world."[3]

All Persian youth of noble birth were practised in archery, and, among all other ancient nations, skill in the use of the bow was regarded as a princely accomplishment.[4]

The annals of ancient Egypt contain frequent allusions to the bow, thus: Sinuhe, an officer attached to the court of Amenem I. (2,400, B. C.) closes his combat with the hero of the opposing host by the following decisive act:

"I shot at him and my weapon stuck in his neck. He cried out! He fell on his nose!"

It gives one no surprise to read that, on observing this condition of their champion,

"All the Bedouins cried out!" [5]

Pentauert ("The Egyptian Homer") puts in the mouth of his patron, Ramses II. (1,400, B. C.), a grandiloquent battle-speech of which the following is a small portion:

"I am as Mont; I shoot to the right and hurl to the left; I am like Baal as a plague upon them. I find the chariot-force of their army lying slaughtered under the feet of my horses Behold, none of them are able to fight before me; their hearts melt in their bodies; their arms fall down; they cannot shoot.[6]

In a letter addressed to one Nechtsotep by some unknown writer under the New Empire (about 1,200, B. C.) occurs the following passage:

"Thou dost see after thy team. Thy horses are as swift as jackals. When they are let go, they are like the wings of the storm. Thou dost seize the reins. Thou takest the bow. We will see now what thy hand can do. Beware of the gorge with the precipice two thousand cubits deep, which is full of rocks and boulders. Thou dost make a detour. Thou dost seize thy bow and showest thyself to the good princes, so that their eye is wearied at thy hand."[7]

1 Remarks of Gen. Pitt Rivers in *Cat. Lond. Anthrop. Col.*, p. 41.—With reference to Gen. Rivers's suggestion it may be permitted to inquire whether—conceding the requisite antiquity of the somewhat complex trap referred to—the uninformed mind of the savage would arrive at the bow with the "readiness" which this skilled military engineer, to whom the invention is familiar, thinks it would be?

2 *A Study of Savage Weapons. Smithsonian Rep., 1879.*

3 *Races of Man*, 185.

4 *Man before Metals*, 222.

5 "The old Lapp woman, Elsa, sat upon the floor, in a deer-skin, and employed herself in twisting reindeer sinews, which she rolled upon her cheek with the palm of her hand." *Northern Travel*, by Bayard Taylor (1859), p. 108. The mingled indolence and conceit of savages is well illustrated in the following: "The acme of respectability among the Bechuhanas is the possession of cattle and a wagon. It is remarkable that, though these latter require frequent repairs, no Bechuhan has ever learned to mend them. Forges and tools have been at their service and teachers willing to aid them, but, beyond putting together a camp-stool, no effort is ever made to acquire a knowledge of the trades. They observe, most carefully, a missionary at work until they understand whether a tire is well welded or not, and then pronounce upon its merit with great emphasis; but there their ambition rests satisfied. It is the same peculiarity among ourselves which leads us in other matters, such as book-making, to attain the excellence of fault-finding without the wit to indite a page. It was in vain I tried to indoctrinate the Bechuhanas with the idea that criticism did not imply any superiority over the workman or even equality with him." *Travels and Researches in South Africa*, by Dr. David Livingstone, 62. *Races of Mankind*, by Robert Brown, 46 and 118.

6 For illustrations of existing stringed instruments traceable to the bow-see: *Through the Dark Continent*, by Henry M. Stanley, 413. For a represen, tation of the Bojesman's musical bow, see: *Travels in the Interior of Southern Africa*, by William John Burchell, Frontispiece to Vol. I.

1 *Life in Ancient Egypt*, by Adolf Erman, Chap. XI.

2 A harp taken, A. D. 1823, from an Egyptian tomb had several remaining strings which, responding to the touch, awoke from a slumber of 3000 years. *Am. Mech. Dict.*, 1063.

3 The *Rig-Veda*, VI., 65, quoted in *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples*, by Otto Schrader.

4 *Encyc. Brit.*, "Archery."

5 *Life in Ancient Egypt*, 371.

6 *Ibid.*, 394.

7 *Ibid.*, 381.

The symbolic use of the bow in the Hebrew scriptures is familiar to every reader, thus: in Genesis, the up-pointed (and therefore pacific) "bow in the cloud" is "the sign" whereby The Elohim vouchsafe assurance of their reconciliation with mankind, much in the same sense as, between aliens and hostiles, at all times and everywhere, the reversed arms or the buried weapon has been the recognised pledge of peace. Thus, The Elohim are made to say:

"This is the token of the covenant which We make between Us and you for perpetual generations: We do set our bow in the clouds, and it shall be for a token of the covenant between Us and the earth, . . . and We will look upon it that We may remember the everlasting covenant between The Elohim and every living creature."[1]

The bow and arrow are also spoken of symbolically in the following passages:

"His bow abode in strength[2] . . . I will spend mine arrows upon them[3] . . . The arrow of Yahveh's deliverance[4] . . . Yahveh will whet His sword; He hath bent His bow and made it ready[5] . . . Thine arrows are sharp in the heart[6] . . . And it shall come to pass in that day that I will break the bow of Israel in the valley of Jezréel."[7]

The following texts seem significant reminders of the antiquity of the barbed arrow-head with poisoned tip:[8]

"Thine arrows stick fast in me.[9] The arrows of the Almighty are within me, the poison whereof drinketh up my spirit."[10]

In the charming story of Ulysses, Penelope imposes on the throng of importunate suiters the following task:

"If *I* the prize and *me* you seek for wife,
Hear the conditions and commence the strife.
Who first Ulysses wond'rous bow shall bend
And through twelve ringlets the swift arrow send;
Him will I follow and forsake my home,
For him forsake this loved, this wealthy dome,
Long—long—the scene of all my past delight
And—to the last—the vision of my night."

When it comes to Ulysses's turn:

"Now—sitting as he was—the cord he drew,
Through ev'ry ringlet leveling his view;
Then notch'd the shaft, released, and gave it wing;
The whizzing arrow vanished from the string,
Sung on direct and threaded ev'ry ring,
The solid gate its fury scarcely bounds,
Pierced through and through, the solid gate resounds."

This feat satisfies Penelope of Ulysses's identity:

"Ah no!—she cries—a tender heart I bear,
A foe to pride, no adamant is there;
And now, ev'n now, it melts, for sure, I see
Once more—Ulysses!—my beloved!—in *thee*."[1]

The frequent allusion, in lyric verse, to Cupid's bow has familiarised the graceful Hellenic legend to all readers, thus: the son of Venus, nettled by Apollo's rebuke on finding the manly bow in the hands of a boy, retaliates by a demonstration of his skill on the god himself:

"Two different shafts he from his bosom draws;
One to repel desire and one to cause.
One shaft is pointed with refulgent gold,
To bribe the love and make the lover bold:
One blunt and tipp'd with lead, whose base allay
Provokes disdain and drives desire away.
The blunted bolt against the nymph he dress'd,
But with the sharp transfix'd Apollo's breast."[2]

EDUCATION.

BY THOS. C. LAWS.

[CONCLUDED.]

Education, in whatever direction it may lie, must follow the order of nature, proceeding from the concrete to the abstract, from the simple to the complex. In matters of science, for example, it is usually forgotten that the "laws of nature" are man's laws, and that, in the history of every department of science, the facts have been discovered first, and the laws or generalisations invented later. The child learns science more readily, with far greater interest and amusement, from the working of a battery or from a series of experiments in chemistry, than from learned dissertations upon the laws of Dalton, Ampère, and Boyle. For this reason, the child's early education should be limited to the concrete sciences which deal with facts themselves, through which the abstract ones, dealing with the laws manifested by those facts, may be easily learned. More especially is logic as we know it, with its uncouth terminology and needless mnemonics, to be avoided, and in its place be given a training in reasoning upon facts. The art of reasoning upon social science—a use to which the so-called "history" of our schools, with its long lists of monarchs and its interminable dates, can never be put—may be imparted in the same way. There are few children, indeed, who are not interested in books of travel and adventure, and who might not in this way be taught many facts relating to the social history, evolution, and organisation of their own and other races, and be induced to make comparisons between them. In a walk in the fields a pupil might be taught very much indeed under a competent teacher—he might learn the names and natures of the flowers he gathered, might find "sermons in stones," and gather facts about bird, beast, insect, and fish, as well as the elements of land-

1 *Gen.* ix, 12.
2 *Gen*, xlix, 24.
3 *Deut.*, xxxii, 23
4 2, *Kings*, xiii, 17.
5 *Psalms*, xii, 12.
6 *Psalms*, xlv, 5.
7 *Hosea*, i, 5.
8 The close affinity of certain ancient names for poison and for the archer's bow; the use by many widely separated existing savage tribes of poisoned arrow-tips, and the near resemblance to such tips of numerous prehistoric specimens, indicates an extreme antiquity for a device which thus (like fire-making) combined chemical with mechanical agents. If the bow-and-arrow was a machine, the poisoned form (τόξον) was more than a machine—it was *an apparatus*.
9 *Psalms*, xxviii, 32.
10 *Job*, vi, 4.

1 *Odyssey*, xxi and xxiii.
2 Ovid's *Met.*, i.

tenure, *grande* and *petite culture*, rent and wages, capital and labor, and so forth. And in this simple and graphic way the interdependence among the sciences might be made manifest, and a sure foundation builded, not for the study of physical science alone, but of political science at the same time, and the child would be led to reflect and to value the rights of citizenship which he will possess, and valuing those rights to fulfil the duties which they involve.

Much is said just now about technical education. Its supporters point to the fact that most people have to earn their living at a trade or profession. On the other hand it is objected that technical education tends to produce jacks of all trades instead of good workmen, that it opens up amateur competition with recognised businesses, and that it tends to abolish apprenticeship. For the last there can be little regret except on the part of those employers who are benefited by the premiums paid. Few ways of learning a business could be more unsatisfactory than is in most cases the apprenticeship system, in which the apprentice is often treated as an errand or page-boy, while the master himself (to whom in too many cases, the premium is everything and the pupil nothing) is incapable through want of experience or ability to give the proper training. As to the other objections, a good all-round technical education has usually, where the pupil is free to make his own choice, as its result the selection by him of a branch of business for which he is specially adapted, after a long experience in several crafts, instead of a nominal selection after a month's experience of one only. The better system cannot but produce better workmen, because those workmen will have been trained under masters qualified to give the necessary training, will have been naturally sorted according to their abilities and tastes, and will have been kept abreast of modern requirements and discoveries. The question of amateur *versus* professional involved is not a serious one, and is rarely raised except upon this question. Many a business man in our large cities is an amateur gardener; many a clerk spends his hours of leisure carpentering; many a schoolmaster is his own electrical engineer; and even bricklayers have taken to amateur photography. In small villages, distant from a large town, jacks of all trades are useful workmen, but the increasing complexity of our social life makes division of labor more than ever a necessity, so that actual competition between the two is becoming more and more difficult. But even if amateur work be on the increase, that means simply a redistribution of tasks, for somebody must produce the tools and the books which the amateur requires. Perhaps the only way in which technical education may injure existing trades is by substituting capable engineers for many skilled workmen, as those in the bootmaking and tailoring trades. But even here the impetus has been given by the tradespeople themselves, and has not been imparted from without. In this connexion reference may be made to the technical education of women. Although the growing equalisation of the sexes cannot but result in women taking upon themselves to some extent the work heretofore performed by men, still to a preponderating extent their position in the household must remain the same as ever. For this reason some experience in the arts of cooking, nursing, household economy, and the like should be obtained as a part of the girl's education.

Something, too, must be said about religious education. This phrase in reality covers at least three distinct questions. Firstly, it is applied to our duty to one another; secondly, to our duty towards the divine powers; and thirdly, to the knowledge and being of those powers. It would certainly be of advantage to dispense entirely with the word "religion" in this connexion. The first question has already been dealt with under the name of moral education; the other two may well be grouped together as theology, and with this I shall proceed to deal. Education should be limited to the imparting, not of guesses, theories, and popular prejudices, but of ascertained facts, and since, in the civilised world, there are so many phases of theological opinion, even within the limits of one's own parish, it may be questioned how far theological ideas are from being ascertained facts, and how far they partake of the nature of hypotheses. It has been observed above that education should begin with the concrete. But it cannot be said that the fundamental notions of theology are such. Strictly they form part of the study of metaphysics, and who would think of instilling Kant, Hegel, or Hamilton into the mind of a child, or of trying to make it acquainted with the theorems of abstract psychology? And when two such orthodox theists as Kant and Dean Mansel knock away all the popular arguments in proof of the existence of the Deity as untenable, upon what grounds shall be based the arguments which we put before the child? The elaborate metaphysical disquisition of Kant upon the necessary existence of God cannot be translated into child language. Doubtless it will be replied that we must teach it as a dogma, and as an unquestionable fact. To this I demur. Putting aside the question of Trinitarianism against Unitarianism, and both against Positivism and Agnosticism, the teaching of a dogma as dogma is utterly opposed to the spirit of this essay. I have all along expounded a theory of education as in verity a process of leading-out, a disciplining of the mind into such order that when facts are obtained they fall naturally into their proper places. I do not doubt that

theological education will continue to be given at home and in Sunday-schools, although I cannot feel disposed to approve even of that. Better by far let the child grow up free and unbiassed, or give him, after the manner already indicated with regard to history and economics, an impartial knowledge of hierology, the comparative and historical science of all religions, new and old, that when his mind becomes fully developed he may select one for himself, as he will do in the case of a profession.

To sum up in a few words the theories herein expounded, a rational theory of education must take into consideration the person to be educated, and must be so applied as to continue the work which nature has already begun, in extending individuality and in bringing into adequate play and thorough discipline all the senses and all the functions of the mind. Examinations for other than specific objects—as sight and sound testing among railroad men—are to be discountenanced. The educationalist must endeavor to better human life in all its relations, and not attempt to create geniuses or walking encyclopædias. In extending the faculties, the true educationalist will seek to supplement memory, observation, and reasoning by sympathy and the æsthetic senses, and give to his charge that physical, mental, and moral discipline which shall insure the greater well-being of the individual, and lay the foundation of a common bond of ethical, social, and political unity, in which the happiness of the one shall be coincident with the well-being of the many.

BAD FOR ME, BUT WORSE FOR HIM.

Sad is the predicament of an author who falls into the hands of an incompetent reviewer, but sadder is the case of the reviewer himself who thus naïvely exposes his incompetence.

A reviewer ought to be familiar with the literature of the subject, but what shall we say of a critic on philosophical literature—a severe critic, of course, and a stern judge—whose knowledge of monism appears to be limited to the dictionary definition of the term.

Mr. George M. Steele, a reviewer of the latest edition of *Fundamental Problems* in the *Boston Commonwealth*, gives his opinion of the book as follows:

"Dr. Paul Carus is a staunch supporter of the theory of *Monism*. Doubtless the believers in this theory have a clear conception of what is meant by this term, but they are not always successful in conveying it to others. As nearly as some of us can make out, it means that there is in the universe but one substance and that this is neither matter nor mind, these last being only manifestations of it. One great obstacle to its comprehension by a considerable class of men will be that they will perversely look upon this substance as a kind of *tertium quid*, so that instead of having but one substance we shall have three! It is a little doubtful whether by this device the subject is much simplified."

It is probable that Mr. Steele resorted for information on monism to Webster; at least the expressions which he uses, are to be found there. Webster defines monism as:

"That doctrine which refers all phenomena to a single constituent or agent. . . . Matter, mind, and their phenomena have been held to be manifestations or modifications of some one substance."

The words "one substance" and matter and mind being manifestations of it do not occur in any one of my expositions of monism; they are Mr. Steele's substitutions.

Had Mr. Steele been familiar with the monism represented by *The Open Court* and *The Monist*, or had he really read *Fundamental Problems*, he would have known that I have again and again objected to the proposition of defining monism as a one-substance theory. One quotation may be sufficient:

"Monism is not 'that doctrine' (as Webster has it) 'which refers all phenomena to a single ultimate constituent or agent.' . . . . Monism means that the whole of Reality, i. e. everything that is, constitutes one inseparable and indivisible entirety. Monism accordingly is *a unitary conception of the world*. It always bears in mind that our words are abstracts representing parts or features of the One and All, and not separate existences. Not only are matter and mind, soul and body abstracts, but also such scientific terms as atoms and molecules, and also religious terms such as God and world."

As to the real significance of monism, which is a method rather than a finished system, a plan of comprehending the world and not the hypothetical assumption of any *tertium quid*; Mr. Steele should read the section entitled "Foundation of Monism" (*Fundamental Problems*, pp. 21–25).

The idea of self-evident truths is an old crux, and all philosophers agree that a philosophy which can do without them is superior to those systems that find them indispensable. Concerning the endeavor to discard self-evident truths, Mr. Steele says:

"It is a little interesting to learn that in the present animosity against what is called orthodoxy in theology and philosophy and science, even mathematics are not free from invasion. We are informed that there is a good deal of 'dogmatism' here that is to be discarded. The author, like some others, apparently does not believe in self-evident or necessary truths. His illustrations are very unfortunate. Thus he gives as one of the axioms that will not stand criticism, that "a straight line is the shortest distance between two points"; which is not an axiom at all, but a conventional definition! So we are to have a reformed mathematics with no dogmatism in them. The author is clearly not an intuitionalist either in physics or in metaphysics."

Mr. Steele imagines that the attempt to get rid of the assumption of self-evident truths springs from a mere prejudice against orthodoxy! But how ill-informed he is! He says "his (!) illustrations," as if *I* had invented the problem of a mathematics without the axiom of parallels. In addition, these problems are to him "mere illustrations"! Mr. Steele has appar-

ently never heard of the labors of such men as Grassmann, Riemann, Gauss, Lobatschewsky, and Hamilton. He finds the idea of "mathematics with no dogmatism in them" grandly ridiculous. The very problem of modern philosophy appears to him a good joke. What a picture of innocence abroad seated on the critic's tripod; and to such men the reviewing of philosophical books is entrusted!

Mr. Steele asks many questions which I shall be glad to answer when the proper occasion arises. We read in his review:

"In explanation of certain evolutionary processes he [viz. the author of *Fundamental Problems*] says: 'Under the constant influence of special irritations special senses are created. Given ether waves of light and sensation, and in the long process of evolution an eye will be formed; given air-waves of sound and sensation, and in the long process of evolution an ear will be formed.' This may be all correct, but it will bear a good deal of explanation. The man without much philosophic apprehension and only common sense might inquire why it is that the eye or the ear always developes in a particular place, and why there are two of each and only two, instead of one or a dozen—why they do not break out on the cheek, or on the back of the head or all over the body, or even in trees and stones?"

I have fallen into the hands of an original critic, whose *vis comica* is apparently involuntary and unconscious. Mr. Steele forgets that a book is devoted to the explanation of special problems. No one can expect in a philosophical treatise a discussion of biological or evolutionary topics, and still less the solution of childish conundrums. A reviewer's business is to discuss the book that is before him, and not to ask impertinent questions. No author can be expected to anticipate and explain all the quibbles with which his critics will quiz him. Moreover, one wise critic can ask more questions than all the authors in the world can answer. P. C.

NOTES.

There are a number of free religious societies in Germany, most of which call themselves German Catholic Congregations. They are, however, in a hard plight, as the government does but partly recognise their religious character, and questions the right of their speakers in their profession. They have been subpœnaed for teaching their religion and for speaking at funerals, while parents are prosecuted for withdrawing their children from religious instruction in public schools for the sake of sending them to their own schools. It is difficult to see on what grounds the Prussian Government can defend its proceedings, which interfere with the conscience and inalienable liberties of their citizens. Even those who do not agree with the tenets of their religion can find nothing in it that is subversive or ultra-radical. Their religion is a kind of pantheism which they uphold with great enthusiasm, summing it up in the sentence, "the world governs itself according to eternal laws." They publish a little sheet, called *Freireligiöses Familien-Blatt*, edited by G. Tschirn, with the assistance of Dr. Völkel and I. Hering, at Chemnitz.

We learn from the *Freireligiöses Familien-Blatt* a fact which has escaped us in the daily press of Germany, or has not, perhaps, received much attention. There is a great number of the clergy belonging to the State Church of Prussia who are no longer willing to surrender their liberty of conscience. Three years ago the authorities of the Prussian State Church enjoined with reference to the theological criticism of modern times that the clergy are bound to believe the apostolic confession of faith as it stands, and should not be allowed to give it their own interpretation. In reply to this proclamation a number of clerymen have of late made the following statement: "Our allegiance at our ordination was not pledged to the letter, but to the religious spirit of the *apostolicum*, and we shall, whether the new or the old *agenda* be introduced, understand it in the future in this sense, as it is our good right in the Church of the Union (viz., the Union of Lutherans and the Reformed Congregations). It is impossible to derive from the decrees of the general synod a right of binding the conscience of a young clergyman at his ordination, as this has expressly been recognised by the Evangelical Oberkirchenrath in their decree of the year 1892. Even the most venerable confession of faith is subject to a re-examination according to the Gospel." This statement has been signed by forty-five Evangelical clergymen of Silesia.

H. Dharmapála sends us a greeting from Buddha Gaya, the most sacred spot of Buddhism, being the place where the Bodhi tree stood, under which Buddha received enlightenment. The Maha-Bodhi Society proposes a restoration of the sacred building which was erected on the spot when Buddhism still flourished in India, and the intention is to found here a college and to make it the centre for the propaganda of Buddhism all over the world.

The Second American Congress of Liberal Religious Societies will be held June 4, 5, and 6 in the Sinai Temple of Chicago. Arrangements have been made to make the meeting a representative one.

A lecture on *Religion as a Factor in Human Evolution* by E. P. Powell, of Clinton, N. Y., has been published by Charles Kerr & Co., Chicago.

THE OPEN COURT

"THE MONON," 324 DEARBORN STREET.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, Post Office Drawer F.

E. C. HEGELER, PUBLISHER. DR. PAUL CARUS, EDITOR

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:

$1.00 PER YEAR. **$0.50 FOR SIX MONTHS.**

N. B. Binding Cases for single yearly volumes of THE OPEN COURT will be supplied on order. Price, 75 cents each.

CONTENTS OF NO. 404.